

**Alignment Project Committee Meeting**  
**Tuesday, January 24, 2006**  
**10:00 a.m.**  
**Committee Minutes**

**P-20 Council Members Present:** Cindy Rudrud, Dr. David Curd, Bob Hagen, Dr. Matt Diethelm, Dean Phillips, Dr. Doug Olesen, Cathy McKee, Cathleen Barton, Amy Besing, and Dr. Jim Zaharis

**Others:** Chuck Jirauch, Lorie O'Brien, Michael Curd, Eric Goesegner, Steve Bella, Sidney Hacker, Dr. Rob Mueller (telephonic)

**Staff:** Debra Raeder, Darcy Renfro

**1. Call to Order, Welcome & Introductions.**

Chair Cindy Rudrud called the meeting to order at 10:05 a.m., welcomed everyone to the meeting and invited those present to introduce themselves.

**2. Approval – Committee Meeting Minutes – October 6, 2005**

There being no discussion on or corrections to the Committee Minutes of October 6, 2005, Cathy McKee moved approval of the minutes as presented. Motion was seconded by Dean Phillips and unanimously approved.

**3. Presentation - Alignment Project Report**

Cindy asked Debra to provide a brief overview of the Project to date and to introduce the presenters for today's presentation. Debra indicated that the report itself was still being revised and edited by Public Works and that the draft written report would be emailed to the Committee on Friday afternoon. Committee members should review the report and submit any comments/input/suggestions on the report no later than close of business on Thursday, February 2, 2006. Debra also updated the Committee on the roundtables that have been conducted to date and indicated that this information is being included in the report. The Tourism industry continues to provide input on report information and will have an additional roundtable on February 9<sup>th</sup>. Information from this roundtable will also be included in the report. Debra then introduced Steve Bella, Sidney Hacker, and Dr. Rob Muller from Public Works to present their findings. (Power Point Presentation is attached.)

Steve Bella, Project Manager for the Alignment Project indicated that the presentation would provide an overview of the information in the report. The emphasis of the report was to look at five major industries that have been targeted in Arizona where job growth or development will be occurring, and identify occupations within these industries that meet a defined high-wage, high-demand/high-growth standard and then to identify specific skills, education and training needed for these occupations. This information

was then validated with industry focus groups. In tandem with this work, Public Works did an analysis on the preparedness of Arizona's high school students for postsecondary study and the workplace focusing on the adequacy of academic preparation and articulation with requirements for post secondary study.

Since Dr. Rob Muller was participating telephonically, Steve presented his findings for the education portion of the report. Steve indicated that the education section of the report focused on looking at the available student performance data, compared Arizona graduation requirements with post-secondary entry requirements as well as how these requirements compare nationally, examined the state standards and AIMS as a graduation requirement, and extrapolated what this information implies for Arizona's secondary education system. Sidney Hacker then presented the information on how high-wage, high-demand/high-growth occupations were identified within the industries, how the required skills, education and training needed for these occupations were analyzed, how this information was compared to secondary education requirements, and then summarized the roundtable results.

The major findings of the report are that Arizona's secondary system is not well aligned with the requirement for post-secondary study and the workplace, and that Arizona high school academic and graduation requirements are not sufficient to equip all students with the necessary skills and knowledge for success. College readiness needs to be the floor for high school graduates. Key gaps include: graduation requirements are insufficient particularly in Math and Science; Arizona does not have a standard college/career course curriculum; Arizona lacks career skills certification programs that identify hard and soft skills; AIMS is not aligned to college and career readiness; and there are substantial data gaps in assessment, common skills language and metric.

The Committee engaged in discussion regarding the need to focus on the greater common needs and issues; that there is a sense of urgency in addressing these issues; and that there is particular concern over common definition for terms used in the presentation (e.g. CTE, Voc Ed., Tech Prep all have the same meaning but appear to be used interchangeably in the presentation – the report should use only one term so as not to confuse the reader). The Committee had considerable discussion other terminology used including the use of the words “goal”, “standard”, and “requirement” and whether these words have the same meaning and are interchangeable. The Committee also had considerable discussion on using terminology of “post-secondary” as opposed to “college ready”. The Committee felt there should be an index of terminology. The Committee also thought it imperative that the Governor's Committee on Teacher Quality and Support review this report for consideration in the work they are doing.

The Committee made the following recommendations for immediate next steps pending the presentation of the final report to the Council:

1. Ascertain for the Committee whether ACT has an alignment report between the ACT Test, Arizona standards, and ACT's work skills certification program WorkKeys.

2. Obtain information for the Committee from Michigan on the ACT/WorkKeys model implemented as a secondary education exit requirement.
3. Obtain information for the Committee on the Early College High School Model.
4. Obtain information for the Committee on how data is shared among Arizona schools when students transfer.
5. Arrange for presentations from other states that have successfully implemented a plan for education/work skills alignment and/or arrange for site visits to other states to see how they implemented such a plan e.g. Michigan.

Debra reminded the Committee members that they would be receiving a copy of the draft report on Friday afternoon, and that any comments/input/suggestions should be submitted by end of business on Thursday, February 2, 2006.

There being no further business or discussion, the meeting was adjourned by the Chair at 12 noon.